# A

# NORTH BRITON

# EXTRAORDINARY:

WRITTEN BY

## A YOUNG SCOTSMAN,

NOW A VOLUNTEER IN THE CORSICAN SERVICE.

Ne quid falsi dicere audeat, ne quid veri non audeat.

CORTE Printed,

AND SOLD BY ALL THE BOOKSELLERS IN EUROPE.

M.DCC.LXIX.

[Price 1s 6d]

Vet A5 e. 2718

Bt from David Low

Cat 129/349

BODLEIAN
P
29 AUG 1958
LIBRARY

# A

# NORTH BRITON

## EXTRAORDINARY.

THE reader of this paper, if any perſon ſhall deign to read it, will find it to be really what its title intimates, a North Briton *Extraordinary*; for the author is induced, by many conſiderations, to proceed in a manner very different from the *ordinary* manner of his celebrated predeceſſor in this work. No miniſter ever had an opportunity of refuſing him an employment under the government, or of treating him with contempt on account of his character; nor does any diſcontented nobleman out of place

give him money to abuſe thoſe who occaſioned his reſignation—diſadvantages under which the author of the *ordinary* North Briton confeſſedly laboured, and which, accordingly, gave a very evident and powerful bias to the exertions of his patriotick zeal. The author of this paper writes not, therefore, to calumniate one perſon, or to gratify the malevolence of another; and as he entertains a ſovereign contempt for the opinion of the mob, he diſdains to pay his court to them, by making a perſonal attack upon any particular leading man, however unpopular, or by laviſhing unmerited praiſe upon any other, however high he may at preſent ſtand in their eſteem. He has the misfortune too, for by our preſent politicians it muſt ſurely be accounted ſuch, ſtill to be influenced by certain prejudices imbibed in early youth; ſuch as an earneſt regard for the happineſs of the kingdom of Great Britain where he was born, and an inſuperable attachment to truth. Theſe prejudices will, by no means, permit him to attempt to raiſe a civil war, by exaſperating one half of his majeſty's ſubjects againſt the other, nor to impoſe on the publick by diſguiſing or inventing facts. At the ſame time,

time, he will avail himſelf of one of the moſt valuable privileges of Britiſh Liberty, to ſpeak out his ſentiments with freedom and boldneſs: but he will on no account employ ſcurrility and abuſive language in place of argument.

*Countrymen*, for tho' born beyond the Tweed, ſo you will permit me to call you, We, who live in this Northern corner of the iſland, have beheld with equal concern and ſurpriſe, the violent political conteſts that have of late diſtracted you, our fellow-ſubjects of the South. Inſtead of the general tranquillity which might have been reaſonably expected to reſult from a peace, that terminated ſo expenſive and ſo bloody a war, nothing has prevailed among you but riot and uproar, as if we had turned our ſwords from the publick enemy, with no other view than to plunge them into the boſoms of one another. It added to our concern to obſerve, that this ſpirit of ſedition, which rendered us ſo contemptible in the eyes of our neighbours, and produced ſuch pernicious conſequences among ourſelves, was induſtriouſly raiſed and kept up by a ſet of factious great men; who, notwithſtanding their flam-

ing profeſſions of patriotiſm, have, by their conduct, made it ſufficiently apparent, that the moſt ſordid ſelf-intereſt has all along been their real motive of action.

For, let us obſerve how theſe gentlemen have proceeded:--Have they, in the whole courſe of their political diſputes, diſcovered the remoteſt intention ſeriouſly to reform any error in government, or to redreſs any one of the multitude of our publick grievances?—Have they, for example, endeavoured to point out a proper method for relieving the nation of the grievous load of taxes, with which it is at preſent oppreſt, to the extent of more than twelve ſhillings in the pound; and which, unleſs a ſpeedy remedy be applied, muſt inevitably terminate, and that very ſoon, in the utter ruin of our trade and manufactures?—Have they ſhewn us, how a more equal mode of taxation is to be obtained, that the induſtrious poor, upon whoſe labours the exiſtence of our ſtate entirely depends, may be taxed no higher, at leaſt, than our great landholders, miniſters of ſtate, and ſtockjobbers; and that a ſmall part of the numberleſs impoſitions, on the moſt common neceſ-

ſaries of life, may be tranferred to ſome of the extravagant articles of luxury, at preſent ſo much in faſhion among the rich and great?—Have they told us, how we are to ſhake ourſelves looſe of that innumerable ſwarm of revenue officers, with whom every corner of the kingdom is now overrun, and who, without contributing in the ſmalleſt degree themſelves to increaſe the publick wealth, live in idleneſs and profuſion on the expences of their uſeful fellow-citizens; and, beſides their unlawful extortions under the name of perquiſites, conſume, in fixed ſalaries, an unconſcionable proportion of the ſums levied, with ſuch difficulty, for the uſe of government?—Have they preſcribed any means of rooting out a ſet of harpies, more uſeleſs and more deſtructive ſtill, I mean penſioners and poſſeſſors of ſinecure offices?—Or, finally, have they been at pains to deviſe any effectual cure for that frightful ſyſtem of corruption, which has at length arrived at ſuch a pitch, as to throw the abſolute diſpoſal of our liberty and property into the hands of the firſt miniſter, who ſhall be daring or wicked enough to employ his influence for that purpoſe? No, my countrymen, this would have been in

effect

effect to deſtroy the very objects of their ambition; for all they were contending for, was the power of converting theſe publick grievances to the private emolument of themſelves and their dependents.

Inſtead of this, they have wholly employed themſelves in reviling one another with the moſt illiberal abuſe, and in reciprocally decrying the integrity and abilities of thoſe for the time in power: and indeed their endeavours for this laſt, purpoſe, have been wonderfully ſucceſsful. The people of England, or rather, perhaps, of London, have not failed, in their uſual way, through a miſtaken zeal for liberty, and the good of their country, to intereſt themſelves in the diſpute with their ordinary heat and fury; but, far from remedying any abuſes in government, they have only ſhewn themſelves the dupes of a parcel of turbulent, mercenary, crafty courtiers, equally devoid of honeſty and capacity, whoſe only fixed principle is an inſatiable avarice, and whoſe ſole ſtudy has been to prevent us from prying too deeply into their conduct, by amuſing us with an *Ignis fatuus*.

The

The attention of all ranks among us has been, now for more than ſix years, almoſt totally engroſſed by theſe political ſquabbles amongſt our leading men; whoſe chief view having been to enrich themſelves and their party, the real intereſts of the kingdom have, in the mean time, been neglected, the p——k m——y ſcandalouſly laviſhed away in b——s and enormous p——ns; and many o——s of high truſt diſpoſed of, by way of reverſion, to the children of thoſe in power. Theſe practices are now become ſo frequent and avowed, that, if a proper check be not quickly deviſed for them, we may have the misfortune to ſee, even in the courſe of this age, one half of our publick revenues diverted from the urgent uſes of government to bribe a noiſy pack of empty declaimers, and to penſion a herd of rapacious courtiers and ſuperannuated ſtateſmen; and, what is perhaps more alarming ſtill, we may ſee every important office in the kingdom, whether in the immediate departments of government, or even in our courts of juſtice, entailed, for generations together, on the children of children unborn.

But what we account the moſt unfortunate circumſtance of all, in this political controverſy, is, that theſe contenders for places and penſions thought it neceſſary, for their private purpoſes, to ſet up a diſtinction between the inhabitants of the South and North parts of the iſland of Britain, in contradiction to one of the moſt ſolemn conventions ever entered into by two independent ſtates; and by reviving thoſe jealouſies and animoſities, which, unhappily both for England and Scotland, had formerly ſubſiſted between them, to deſtroy that unanimity which alone has raiſed us to ſuch an envied pitch of glory and power, and to provoke us to commence a civil war, which muſt unavoidably have proved more bloody in its progreſs, and more deſtructive in its event, than the fatal contention of the red and white roſes*. And for what mighty purpoſe was this deteſtable attempt made?——Why, truly, no other than

* How long a warlike people, ſo celebrated in the annals of Europe for courage and bravery, ſo tenacious of their liberties and honour, will brook the inſults of a liberty-bawling brutal Engliſh mob, we cannot determine: hitherto they have given a ſhining proof of their loyalty and good ſenſe.

that

that of diſgracing one miniſter of Scots extraction, whom they regarded as a dangerous rival in the royal favour.

Although this miniſter had been educated, and had ſpent his whole life in England; although his whole fortune, except a very ſmall part of it, was ſituated in England; and although all his immediate and moſt endearing connexions were with Engliſh families of the firſt diſtinction, whence, by every tie, whether moral or political, he was, ſuppoſing the intereſts of England and Scotland different, infinitely more concerned in the welfare of the former than of the latter; yet thoſe worthy patriots, equally regardleſs of the dictates of truth as of the happineſs of their country, reſolved to overlook all thoſe other circumſtances, and to avail themſelves of that of his being born of Scots parents to render him odious to the Engliſh mob. Aſhamed, however, openly to appear in ſo unworthy a cauſe, they pitched on a man deſtitute of every ſentiment of religion and honour, of obſcure birth, deſperate fortune, turbulent diſpoſition, and who was exaſperated againſt the Scot on account of ſome perſonal indignity

dignity received from him, to be the tool of their private vengeance. Glad of ſo favourable an opportunity of indulging his own reſentment, of ingratiating himſelf with a party, and of earning a ſubſiſtance, this man chearfully undertook the office of a publick incendiary, and acquitted himſelf of the taſk in a manner ſuitable to his character. He exerted every reſource of his ingenuity, to revive and inflame all the vulgar prejudices, that, in the moſt hoſtile times, had prevailed amongſt the Engliſh againſt their Northern neighbours; and, to effect the diſgrace of one man, he did not heſitate to revile a whole nation with the baſeſt ſcurrility.

Happily for Great Britain, that ferocious warlike ſpirit, which was formerly the ruling paſſion of the inhabitants of Scotland, was then ſubſided; we therefore deſpiſed the torrent of ſilly abuſe, which was ſo plentifully poured out againſt us, becauſe it appeared to be calculated only for the loweſt mob, and of ſuch a nature as would diſguſt every perſon of common underſtanding; and we pitied the man, who could proſtitute the ſmall portion of genius that nature has beſtowed on him, in

ſo

ſo villainous a work. We doubted not that the candour, generoſity, and good ſenſe, for which the Engliſh are ſo juſtly celebrated, would in a little time open the eyes of ſuch as might at firſt ſuffer themſelves to be deluded by the artful repreſentations of this infamous ſlanderer, and make them ſenſible of the injuſtice of his inſinuations.

But tho' we have good reaſon to believe, that theſe our expectations have been in a great meaſure juſtified, yet it is with extreme ſorrow we perceive, that the minds of many among our brethren of England ſtill retain injurious impreſſions of the inhabitants of this country, not indeed ſo much owing to the ſuperficial labours of the authour of the North Briton, as to thoſe of other writers of much ſuperior abilities, who ſuppoſed it might anſwer their private ends to improve on the crude allegations of that author. Others, again, obſerving how highly the mob were delighted with the national reflections employed by thoſe writers, ſtudied to imitate them in that reſpect, which they found the ſureſt method of procuring a reading to their otherways ſtupid pro-

productions. By theſe means the preſent taſte of political writing, is, at all events, to revile the poor Scots. No ſooner, therefore, is a courtier, in conſequence of ſome private ſquabble among our grandees, ſtruck off the penſion liſt, or diſmiſt from ſome ſinecure office, than he directs the whole artillery of his own eloquence, and that of a parcel of hirling writers, againſt the *favourite*, who is ſtill ſuppoſed, how truly it is neither my buſineſs nor intention to inquire, to be the main ſpring of all miniſterial commotions; and in gratifying his reſentment againſt the fancied author of his diſgrace, he vents the moſt virulent invectives againſt the whole body of the Scots nation. Hence the epithet *Scottiſh* is now hardly ever to be met with in South Britain, except as conveying an idea of the higheſt reproach; and the vulgar of that country, both high and low, affect to regard every native of North Britain as conſtitutionally a villain, either utterly devoid of every generous independent ſentiment, and our country in general as the diſgrace and ruin of their own.

How

How far this manner of proceeding is reconcilable with that liberal caſt of thinking, which, among foreigners, is accounted the diſtinguiſhing characteriſtic of Engliſhmen, with that generoſity of behaviour on which the Engliſh value themſelves ſo much, or with the principles of ſound policy, I ſhall leave to others to determine; but as a Scotſman, and, what is more, as a friend to the general happineſs of the Iſland of Great Britain, I think myſelf obliged to endeavour, by a temperate and candid repreſentation of facts, to vindicate my Countrymen, to the conviction of every Engliſhman who *will* be convinced, from ſuch of theſe injurious aſſertions as carry with them the leaſt appearance of plauſibility.

To undertake a ſerious refutation of the numberleſs topicks of vulgar abuſe ſo copiouſly inſiſted on by the author of the North Briton and his imitators, in order to render the inhabitants of Scotland ridiculous and hateful in the eyes of the Engliſh mob, were as impertinent as it is repugnant to my inclination; and to attempt a recrimination in the ſame ſtile on you our fellow ſubjects of England, whatever pleaſure it might afford

ford to a certain claſs of readers, were no leſs inconſiſtent with my deſign than it is above my capacity. At the ſame time, I cannot help obſerving, that to a writer, bleſt with a moderate degree of the *ſcolding* talents of the author of the North Briton, a large fund of materials, for executing a taſk of this kind, would not be wanting. Such a writer would find an excellent opportunity for diſplaying his declamatory talents, in expoſing the abſurdity of a whole nation being reproached on account of a rebellion unluckily commenced in their country, ſolely becauſe its remoteneſs from the ſeat of government rendered it the moſt convenient for ſuch an attempt, by a man who had not only endeavoured, by the moſt daring perſonal attack on the beſt of ſovereigns, to alienate from him the confidence and affection of his ſubjects, but had actually occaſioned an open rebellion againſt the laws of his country. Again, what more favourable ſubject would he deſire on which to exerciſe his ridicule, than that of a country having been upbraided for its poverty by a notorious bankrupt, who was at that very moment ſubſiſting on the contributions of his acquaintance, and openly ſoliciting

liciting the publick to pay his debts by ſubſcription.

On the other hand, in point of national abuſe, ſuch a writer might perhaps find means to prove, that folly, vice, and diſeaſe of every denomination (for, however ſtrange it may ſeem, even *diſeaſe* has been made a ſubject of reproach againſt the poor Scots) flouriſh as abundantly, at leaſt, in South as in North Britain: and he might find very ample matter for a ſpecies of wit, not indeed the moſt delicate, but which has been very much, and very ſucceſsfully cultivated by the author of of the North Briton and his coadjutors, in proving, for example, that more people die annually, within the city of London alone of *ſurfeits*, than within the whole kingdom of Scotland of *famine* —That *ſelf-murder* and the *French pox* prevail more in England than the *itch* does in Scotland —And that there are more *cuckolds* within the bills of mortality than *jacobites* in all the country beyond the Tweed.

On the other hand, what a fruitful field of perſonal abuſe preſents itſelf againſt the famous perſonage

ſonage eſpecially, whoſe rancorous ſoul firſt conceived the truly helliſh deſign of ſacrificing private reputation, in a public diſpute, by the vileſt arts of calumny and detraction! Shew me another man in the kingdom of Great Britain, whoſe life exhibits ſuch an uniform ſcene of all the moſt atrocious vices and villainies that ever diſhonoured human nature, as that of the King's Bench *Hero:* even treaſon and blaſphemy have not been wanting to complete the ſhocking picture. I will, however, ſay no more on ſo diſagreeable a ſubject, for the very idea of ſuch a character is painful.

But till a writer, endowed with ſome portion of this patriot's ſpirit, ſhall make his appearance on this ſide of the queſtion, let the author of the North Briton retain the undiſputed poſſeſſion of this precious province of mobbiſh declamation. For, as I write with a view to conciliate, not to inflame, I will carefully avoid all aſperity of expreſſion, and every argument founded on no better ground than vulgar prejudices. Arguments of this ſort, however well they may be adapted to the capacity of ſuch patriots as the gentleman

*in the two dirty red waiſtcoats, but without any coat,* who diſtinguiſhed himſelf ſo highly in St. George's Fields, can certainly make no other impreſſion on a ſenſible and ingenuous mind than that of abhorrence and diſguſt.

The author of the North Briton, and the other political writers, who have of late endeavoured, with all their might, to provoke the inhabitants of this iſland to cut the throats of one another, not only ventured, in direct contradiction to the fundamental principle of the Union, to arraign, as an attack on the Engliſh conſtitution, the appointment of a Scotſman to any of the great offices of ſtate, but likewiſe to repreſent all Scotſmen, in general, as *of ſuch an abject ſlaviſh diſpoſition, and ſuch devoted abettors of arbitrary ſway,* as rendered them wholly improper for holding any office of truſt under a free government like that of England, or for enjoying any ſhare in the private eſteem or public councils of a Britiſh monarch. In ſupport of this aſſertion, they inſiſted, with particular acrimony, on the tyrannical acts of the firſt princes of the Stuart family who filled the Engliſh throne, as the effect of Scottiſh

principles; and reviled, at the ſame time, thoſe princes in the moſt opprobrious terms, without reflecting, I dare ſay, that by ſo doing they offered the groſſeſt inſult to our preſent excellent Sovereign, who wears the crown of Great Britain in conſequence of no other title than his being a deſcendant of that family.

But of all the extravagant aſſertions into which the fury of party zeal has hurried thoſe writers, the moſt unfortunate, without compariſon, is this of the *ſlaviſh* diſpoſition natural to Scotſmen, and *their devoted attachment to arbitrary ſway*. As it is, however, one of the capital arguments inſiſted on, not only by the author of the North Briton, who is now exerciſing his ſuperior abilities on a portion of the Engliſh hiſtory, particularly choſen by him with a view further to illuſtrate this his darling poſition, but likewiſe by others, from whoſe learning and candour more accuracy might have been expected, it may be proper briefly to enquire how far it is well founded; though I muſt ſay, the point appears ſo very clear to me, that I am almoſt aſhamed to argue it.

In

In the firſt place then, as a proof that the Scots, inſtead of being of a *ſlaviſh* diſpoſition, *have been, from the earlieſt times, actuated by the moſt brave and independent ſpirit.* I muſt be excuſed by our Southern neighbours for puting them in mind, That thoſe warlike Romans, who found means *to reduce their country into a province*, never were able to make any laſting ſettlement *beyond the Tweed*—That thoſe Saxons, who impoſed *the yoke of ſervitude* on the inhabitants of *South Britain*, when abandoned by the Romans, *attempted in vain to extend their dominions into Scotland*—That the Danes, *who ſubdued both Britons and Saxons*, found it impoſſible, *after repeated invaſions of our country*, in which a deluge of blood was ſpilt, *to hold poſſeſſion of a ſingle province*—That even William of Normandy, who made ſo complete a conqueſt of England, was effectually ſtopped in his victorious career by the Scots, whoſe king, Malcolm III. generouſly protected, in ſpite of the Conqueror, the lineal heir of the Engliſh throne, together with many of the moſt eminent Engliſh barons, who flocked into our country to enjoy that liberty which was no longer to be found in their own.

But this is not all: the ſame ſpirit of valour and independency enabled the Scots to maintain, through a ſtruggle continued for ages together, and attended with a dreadful effuſion of blood, the liberties of their country full and unimpaired, againſt the moſt violent attacks of the greateſt Engliſh monarchs, particularly the two Edwards, I. and III. who, though confeſſedly the moſt artful, brave, and powerful princes of their time; though poſſeſſed not only of England, a country of nearly double the extent of Scotland, but likewiſe of Wales, Ireland, and a great part of France; and though ſupported by a numerous faction of the Scots, who, in conſequence of a controverted title to their crown, were fatally divided among themſelves, a circumſtance of which their enemies took the full advantage, nevertheleſs found it impoſſible to ſubdue our country.

It is apparent, therefore, that thoſe writers, in reproaching the Scots on account of their *ſlaviſh puſillanimous diſpoſition*, are ſhamefully ignorant in the hiſtory both of their own country and of ours, and that they could hardly have advanced a more groundleſs aſſertion.

But

But let us next inquire, whether the other branch of their propoſition, namely, *that the Scots are devoted abettors of arbitrary ſway*, be better founded. I think it neceſſary, however, to premiſe, that though in diſcuſſing this point, I ſhall be obliged to mention certain proceedings of the Scots nation, which, however expreſſive of the *liberal independent ſentiments* entertained by that people, ſhall no doubt, to many ſenſible people, appear highly violent and outrageous, yet it muſt be underſtood, that ſo far from approving of ſome of theſe proceedings, I conſider them as altogether indefenſible on any ſolid principle of good government. Here, indeed, our accuſers ſeem to have erred egregiouſly in chooſing their ground; for they ſhould certainly have found a much fairer opportunity of abuſing the Scots, for a certain ungovernable ſeditious temper, that rendered them impatient of the ſlighteſt controul, than for being ſervile favourers of deſpotick meaſures. They undoubtedly inherited more of the Grecian than of the Perſian ſpirit.—But to proceed.

Robert I. was not only one of our wiſeſt and braveſt princes, but had rendered himſelf, in a peculiar manner, the idol of his ſubjects, on account of his having glorioufly retrieved, from the very brink of perdition, the honour and independency of their country, by a courſe of the moſt heroick exploits recorded in hiſtory, and particularly by the deciſive battle of Bannockburn, wherein, with a handful of men, he completely defeated a moſt formidable army, commanded by Edward II. of England in perſon. Yet how was this ſame Robert anſwered, when, in a parliament holden at Perth, he deſired his barons to produce the charters by which they held their lands?—They, to a man, drew their ſwords, and told him theſe were their charters. Did this ſavour like a tame ſubmiſſion to the arbitrary pleaſure of their prince?

Our firſt king of the name of James, when a boy only fourteen years old, having been made priſoner by the Engliſh in his paſſage to France, although during a ſuſpenſion of hoſtilities between the two nations, was, for the ſpace of twenty years, detained a captive in England; where, however,

however, he received an education ſuitable to his birth, firſt under Henry IV. and afterwards under his ſon Henry V. James poſſeſſing a fine genius, and an uncommon degree of penetration, profited fully by the excellent education beſtowed on him, and not only became in a ſhort time, maſter of all the ordinary branches of knowledge ſtudied in thoſe days, but likewiſe acquired a thorough acquaintance with the art of government, particularly that of England, where it was then a ruling maxim in the politicks of the prince, to take every occaſion of encreaſing the royal domain at the expence of the great barons. As this was a leſſon no where more uſeful than in Scotland, where many barons poſſeſſed a territory little inferior to the patrimony of the crown, James was no ſooner releaſed from his captivity, than he began to put in practice this maxim of Engliſh politicks: but, in executing his ſcheme, he proceeded with rather too much precipitation, and thereby ſo provoked his ſubjects, that they quickly formed a conſpiracy againſt him, which obliged him to relinquiſh, very abruptly, an expedition he was then ſucceſsfully proſecuting againſt England. This did not, however, ſtop the

machinations

machinations of the conſpirators, of whom the moſt active was Robert Graham, the uncle and guardian of the young earl Palatine of Strathern, who had been, by James, very unjuſtly diſpoſſeſſed, under colour of law, of that extenſive earldom. The king, at laſt, attoned for his oppreſſion with his life.—Has this the appearance of a blind ſubmiſſion to deſpotick meaſures?

James II. regardleſs of this example, purſued the very ſame project that had occaſioned his father's ruin. This conduct involved him in continual diſputes with his principal ſubjects, which, in all probability, would have proved as fatal to him as to his father, if an accidental death had not put an early period to his reign.

James III. by unwiſely imitating the conduct of his father and grand father, rendered his reign one continued ſcene of commotions, till at length his nobles were exaſperated to ſuch a degree, that they levied forces and oppoſed him in the open field. The king loſt his life in the battle. This infatuated prince had his *favourites* too, who ingroſſed his whole confidence, laboured to

increaſe

increaſe his jealouſy of his principal barons, and, in a word, directed all his councils. But thoſe favourites were, like my friend the author of the North Briton, *unprincipled fellows of obſcure birth, and like him acted from private motives of reſentment and ſelf-intereſt.* They met with a fate worthy of their rank and their crimes: The diſcontented barons went in a body to the tent of the king, though then at the head of a powerful army, ſeized on ſix of thoſe miſcreants, and hanged them over a neighbouring bridge.—Looks this like a ſlaviſh complaiſance for the will of their ſovereign.

It muſt be remembered, that in this inquiry I have confined myſelf to a few of the moſt ſtriking inſtances of the publick ſpirited oppoſition made by the ſubjects of Scotland to what they deemed illegal encroachmcnts on their privileges. To mention the whole were an endleſs taſk; for, from the return of James I. from his Engliſh captivity, where he had learnt that ſyſtem of politicks which was productive of ſuch fatal conſequences to himſelf and his poſterity, to the glorious æra of the revolution, the internal hiſtory of Scotland exhibits, in a great meaſure, one perpetual

petual ſtruggle between the prepogative of the crown, and the privileges of the people.

To what extremity the diſputes was carried in the time of our lovely but unfortunate queen Mary, muſt be ſo well known to every Engliſhman of any reading, as to make it unneceſſary for me to remind him of it. She was, by her ſubjects, obliged to encourage a religion contrary to that of her heart, and to perſecute thoſe of her own perſuaſion.—She was forced to receive as her huſband a man for whom ſhe entertained no affection—She was oppoſed by them in battle—made a priſoner—dethroned—and at laſt expelled her own kingdom. In theſe diſtreſsful circumſtances, ſhe threw herſelf into the arms of her neareſt relation, Elizabeth of England, who was a queen like herſelf, but as cruel, abſolute, and arbitrary, as Mary was tender hearted, complying, and oppreſſed. There, inſtead of meeting with the kindneſs and protection due to her blood, her ſex, and her misfortunes, ſhe underwent a ſcene of perſecution and diſtreſs, that would have diſhonoured the moſt barbarous prince, and which cannot be read without exciting the deepeſt compaſſion. Elizabeth,

beth, actuated by a mean ſpirited jealouſy of her beauty and accompliſhments, kept her cloſe priſoner, under various pretences, for no leſs a ſpace than eighteen years. But not ſatisfied with making her undergo ſo long a courſe of the moſt rigorous oppreſſion, the ſavage ſoul of Elizabeth could be no otherways appeaſed than with the blood of the unhappy Mary, whoſe grey-head was at laſt ſevered from her body on a ſcaffold.

Mary's reign, likewiſe, preſents us with the fate of a ſuppoſed *favourite*. Rizzio an Italian, and the private ſecretary of Mary for her foreign diſpatches, was ſuppoſed to have acquired too great influence in Mary's councils. A conſpiracy, therefore, was formed againſt him, and he was murdered in his miſtreſs's preſence.

From what has been ſaid, we think it abundantly plain, notwithſtanding the ignorant aſſertions of our late dabblers in political controverſy, that of all the nations of Europe, not excepting our Brethren of England, the diſpoſition of the Scots was the moſt repugnant to arbitrary govern-

government. But ſtill further, to ſatisfy you, my countrymen, of this truth, I will juſt inform you of two or three of the fundamental principles of the ancient Scottiſh conſtitution, that ſo you may be able to draw a compariſon between it, and the preſent conſtitution of Great Britain.

The parliament of Scotland anciently conſiſted *of all who held any portion of Land, however ſmall, of the crown, by military ſervice.* This parliament appointed the times of its own meeting and adjournment, and committees to ſuperintend the adminiſtration during the intervals of parliament—It had a commanding power in all matters of government—It appropriated the publick money, ordered the keeping of it, and called for the accompts—It arm'd the people, and appointed commanders—It named and commiſſioned ambaſſadors—It granted and limited pardons—It appointed judges and courts of judicature—It named officers of ſtate and privy counſellors—It annexed and alienated the revenues of the crown, and reſtrained grants by the king. The king of Scotland had no *negative* voice in parliament—nor could he either declare war—

make

make peace—or conclude any other publick buſineſs of importance, without the advice and approbation of parliament.

But ſtill, perhaps, theſe gentlemen will triumphantly aſk me, where James, the firſt prince of the Stuart line who reigned in England, imbibed the extravagant notions of *Divine indefeaſable right—Paſſive obedience—Non reſiſtance, &c.* which he was continually labouring to inculcate, and which, in the ſequel, proved ſo fatal to his ſon and grandſon.

To me it appears extremely improbable, that the ſituation of James's affairs in Scotland could ſuggeſt theſe deſpotic notions to that prince, or that he could entertain any reaſonable expectation of ever perſuading the people of that country to adopt them. The whole tenor of their behaviour towards every one of his ſix immediate predeceſſors, but particularly his own mother, whoſe melancholy fate muſt have been recent in his memory, nay even towards himſelf, left him no room to hope that they would give any countenance to doctrines ſo diametrically oppoſite to

thoſe

thoſe on which they and their forefathers had ſo uniformly acted. On the contrary, nothing was more probable, than that the bad ſuggeſtion of them would inſpire his ſubjects with ſuch a degree of indignation, as might be no otherways allayed than by his dethronement at leaſt, if not his death.

Beſides the unanſwerable argument againſt this ſuppoſition, ariſing from the ſituation of James's affairs in Scotland, and the diſpoſition of the people of that country, there is one of a private nature, but no leſs concluſive, perhaps, than the former, and that is, the ſentiments of his principal tutor, Buchannan, than whom no writer whatever, in any age or nation, ever carried *oppoſing* principles, if I may uſe the expreſſion, to a greater height. Of this fact, that author's elegant hiſtory of Scotland affords the moſt ſatisfactory evidence. But not ſatisfied with what he had occaſionally advanced there, Buchannan ventured to compoſe a ſeperate treatiſe, entitled, *De Jure Regni apud Scotos*, profeſſedly intended to prove, among other points, that upon the general principles of reaſon and expediency, all ſubjects have

have an inherent right to oppoſe the tyrannical attempts of their ſovereigns, and to oblige them, by every poſſible means, not even excepting dethronement and death, to conform their conduct to the laws of the kingdom; and that the people of Scotland in particular, had, from the earlieſt times, exerciſed this right as often as circumſtances required.—This diſſertation is written with ſuch uncommon elegance of language, and ingenuity of argument, as juſtly intitles it to a place among the moſt perfect productions in the ſame ſpecies of writing.

But it may be worth the while to conſider, whether the ſtate of Engliſh affairs, or the general diſpoſition of the people of that country, at the time when James had a moral certainty of ſucceeding to the Engliſh crown, were ſuch as might poſſibly have ſuggeſted ſuch doctrines to that prince. Here my countrymen of England muſt forgive me for reminding them of an important fact in the hiſtory of their country, namely, *That in the ſame proportion as the power of the ſubject in Scotland gained on that of the crown, the power of the crown in England gained on that of the*

*the ſubject.* Thoſe powerful barons, who in the days of John, of Henry III. of Edward II. and Richard the II. had converted the government of England into a kind of Ariſtocracy, in the courſe of the long and bloody conteſt between the houſes of York and Lancaſter, had not only ruined their fortunes, but, in a great meaſure, extirpated their families; while in the mean time the royal domain, by repeated forfeitures and annexations, had increaſed to an exorbitant pitch. Accordingly, it is certain, that from the period of that fatal diſpute, *The princes of the houſe of Tudor governed the people of England in the moſt arbitrary manner.*

*Henry* VII. the firſt of that race, practiſed, without controul, the moſt oppreſſive extortion.—His ſon *Henry* VIII. ruled with a rod of iron, and carried his tyranny to ſuch a ſhocking length, that under frivolous pretences, and in expreſs contradiction to every principle of juſtice and humanity, he cauſed to be ſtruck off, on publick ſcaffolds, the heads of many of his beſt and nobleſt ſubjects.—*Mary* exceeded, if poſſible, even her father in tyranny, cruelty, and injuſtice.—

And

And *Elizabeth*, beſides the other tyrannical qualities of her father and ſiſter, inherited no inconſiderable portion of their bloody diſpoſition. Hence, during her long reign, every article of the ſo much boaſted Engliſh conſtitution was arbitrarily broken through; and the publick ſcaffolds ſtreamed with the innocent blood of her greateſt ſubjects: and it is particularly to be remarked, that the two moſt tyrannical eſtabliſhments ever inſtituted by any Engliſh prince, viz. the Star Chamber, and High Commiſſion court, were children of Elizabeth's deſpotick reign.

All this being well known to James, it was extremely natural for him to deſire to reign as abſolutely as thoſe his immediate predeceſſors. But, as cruelty evidently appears to have been no part of his character, he did not chuſe to ſupport his authority by the violent meaſures they had employed. James followed a method more agreeable to his natural diſpoſition: he reduced the doctrines of deſpotiſm to certain abſtract propoſitions of the nature of thoſe taken notice of above; in the demonſtration of which, he propoſed to himſelf the double pleaſure of convincing his ſubjects of

the truth of thoſe favourite doctrines, and, at the ſame time, of giving the world a ſhining proof of his rhetorial powers, and his profound ſkill in the ſcience of argumentation.

In every view, therefore, it ſeems more reaſonable to ſuppoſe, that thoſe deſpotick maxims of king James, for which the poor Scots have been ſo groſsly reproached, were in fact the growth of England itſelf, or at leaſt ſuggeſted to him by the ſituation of affairs in that kingdom. Thoſe writers, therefore, who pretend to inſtruct us in the nature of our conſtitution, and ſtand forth as cenſors of government, in reviling the Scots on this account, have either been ſhamefully ignorant of the hiſtory of the kingdom, whoſe conſtitution they preſume to explain, or elſe have been guilty of the groſſeſt calumny.

I cannot conclude on this point, without taking notice of the behaviour of the Scots, on occaſion of the great effort made for publick liberty in the time of Charles I. The hiſtory of that important period informs us, that the Scots were the firſt who bravely took up arms in defence of

of their privileges, while their neighbours of England were, in their uſual way, wrangling and diſputing: and it is an indiſputable fact, that to the vigorous proceedings of the Scots at that juncture, the ſucceſs of the parliament party was chiefly owing.—In like manner, as they were the firſt who oppoſed the unconſtitutional attempts of the father, ſo were they the firſt who endeavoured to reſtore the publick tranquillity by bringing back the ſon.

Nor were the Scots leſs zealous or active in aſſerting their liberties againſt the tyrannical encroachments of James VII. and in promoting the Revolution, which, whatever ſome ignorant hiſtorians, and more ignorant political pamphleteers may boaſt of Magna Charta, was alone the glorious æra of Britiſh liberty.

Having thus proved, to the conviction, I hope, of every perſon of ſenſe and candour, that the People of Scotland have been, from the earlieſt times, animated by the warmeſt glow of liberty, and thence teſtified, on every occaſion, an inſuperable averſion to arbitrary government, and a

more than Engliſh deteſtation of worthleſs royal favourites. I will now proceed to the principal buſineſs of this paper, namely, to enquire, whether the preſent connection of England with Scotland be ſo advantageous to the latter, or ſo prejudicial to the former, as the author of the North Briton and his followers have ventured to inſinuate.

As nothing could be more obvious than the expediency of having all the inhabitants of this iſland united into one people, actuated by the ſame common intereſt, and governed by the ſame king, ſo it evidently appears from hiſtory that this was an object very early attended to.

The firſt favourable opportunity, for carrying this important meaſure into execution, occurred in the time of Edward I. when upon the death of king Alexander III. of Scotland, the crown of that kingdom devolved on Alexander's infant grand-daughter, who is known in hiſtory by the name of the Maiden of Norway. This opportunity of uniting in his family the entire ſovereignty of the iſland of Britain was not loſt by Edward, who, immediately on Alexander's death, ſet on foot

foot a negociation with the Scots barons for obtaining their conſent to a marriage between their young queen and his eldeſt ſon Edward of Carnarvon. Edward managed this negociation with his uſual addreſs, and at laſt, in ſpite of a powerful oppoſition among the Scottiſh nobility, and the general diſlike of the body of the people, ſucceeded in his project: but the conditions under which the Scots agreed to the match are highly worthy of our particular attention, as they furniſh a very ſtriking proof how extremely anxious the Scots of thoſe days were to guard againſt every thing that might, in any degree, affect the independency of their country. The conditions were theſe.*

"That the rights, laws, liberties and cuſtoms "of Scotland ſhall for ever remain entire and "unalterable, and the kingdom continue ſepera-"ted, divided, and free in itſelf, without any ſub-"jection, by its true bounds and limits, as it had "been before—That if Edward and Margaret "ſhall die without iſſue of the body of Margaret, "the kingdom ſhall revert entire, free and inde-"pendent, to the next immediate heir—That the

* Fœder. Anglican. p. 489.

"king-

" kingdom of Scotland ſhall have its chancellor, " officers of ſtate, courts of judicature, &c. as be- " fore, and that a new ſeal ſhall be made and " kept by the chancellor, but with the ordinary " arms of Scotland engraven on it—That parlia- " ments, when called to treat of matters concern- " ing the ſtate and inhabitants of Scotland, ſhall be " holden within the bounds of that kingdom— " That no duties, taxes, levies of men, &c. ſhall " be exacted in Scotland, but ſuch, as being uſual " in former times, ſhall conſiſt with the common " intereſt and good of the nation."

The death of queen Margaret prevented this marriage from taking effect. The diviſions, however, that aroſe among the Scots in conſequence of the ſubſequent competition for their crown, afforded Edward a more convenient opportunity than even his moſt ſanguine wiſhes could have deſired, of making the kingdom of Scotland dependent on England, and that without ſubjecting himſelf to the diſagreeable reſtraints juſt mentioned; but the means he behoved to employ for this purpoſe, were of a very different nature from thoſe before concerted. The event

is well known. Edward, after having, to all appearance, completely ſubdued the Scots, chiefly by the aſſiſtance of the Scots themſelves, and after having taken the moſt effectual meaſures for ſecuring his conqueſt, by deſtroying and carrying off all their records, together with the other monuments of their independency, and by detaining thoſe of their coutrymen, from whom he apprehended any diſturbance, priſoners in England, nevertheleſs, before his death, had the mortification to ſee all his endeavours fruſtrated, and the brave Scots, after the many miſeries his cruel policy had inflicted on them, once more take up arms to aſſert their liberty.

Edward III. a prince as artful and brave as his grandfather, and much more powerful, adopted the ſame plan of policy with regard to the Scots; and under pretence of ſupporting Baliol's title to their crown, exerted his utmoſt efforts to make a conqueſt of their country. But after having in perſon conducted into Scotland no fewer than nine different expeditions, in the courſe of which he had gained conſiderable advantages over the Scots, owing in a great meaſure to the vigorous efforts

of

of the Scottiſh faction that favoured Baliol, and had repeatedly laid waſte their country with fire and ſword; and after having made their king, as well as many of their chief barons priſoners, Edward found it impoſſible to accompliſh his purpoſe by force, and therefore had recourſe to negociation. As the event of this negociation reflects ſingular honour on the prudence as well as the magnanimity of thoſe ancient Scots, I will make no apology for inſerting entire the terms of agreement* propoſed by Edward, eſpecially as they will not take up much room.

" 1*mo*. That towards a final peace, and a " happy union of the two kingdoms, the king of " Scotland ſhould propoſe to the community of " his ſubjects, that in caſe he himſelf ſhould die " without heirs of his own body, which God for- " bid, they would agree and conſent, that the " king of England and his heirs ſhould ſucceed " him in the throne: † upon which condition the " king

* Barnes, p. 426, 427.

† This ſtiputation, ſuppoſing it to have taken effect, was of very ſmall importance to king David: for, beſides the ſtrong

" king of England became bound: 2*do.* That " he ſhould forgive and for ever diſcharge the " whole ſum ſtill due for the ranſom of king " David. 3*tio.* That he ſhould inſtantly ſurren- " der and give up to king David and the crown " of Scotland, all the towns and territories for- " merly poſſeſſed by king Robert Bruce, particu- " larly the town, caſtle and county of Berwick, " the caſtle of, and neighbouring country to " Roxburgh, the caſtles of Jedburgh, Lochma- " ben, &c. 4*to.* That he ſhould give full ſatis-

ſtrong objections to the title of the *Brucean* race to the throne of Scotland, which, by the rules of inheritance for ſeveral ages paſt obſerved in Scotland as well as moſt other kingdoms in Europe, undoubtedly belonged to the *Baliol* family, David, at this time, had no other near relation exiſting, except one nephew, Robert, ſon of the High Steward, by his eldeſt ſiſter. Now, all our hiſtorians inform us, that Robert had, a little while before this period, incurred the ſevere diſpleaſure of the king his uncle, as well as of the Scots nation in general, by his behaviour at the battle of Durham, where the king had been made priſoner; which, if not traiterous, as was then on very probable grounds violently ſuſpected, was, at leaſt, cowardly. It cannot therefore be ſuppoſed that king David was very ſolicitous about ſecuring the otherwiſe doubtful right of ſucceſſion of this Robert.

" faction

" faction and equivalent eſtates in England to the
" earl of Athole, the lords de Beaumont, Percy,
" Ferrers, Talbot, &c. for their claims and other
" poſſeſſions in Scotland. *5to. That he ſhould re-*
" *pone king David to all the rights, dignities and*
" *territories*, (that is, *to the counties of Northumber-*
" *land, Cumberland, Weſtmorland, Huntington, Pa-*
" *latinate of Cheſter, &c.) his anceſtors and predeceſ-*
" *ſors had ever enjoyed in England:* provided, ne-
" vertheleſs, that he and his heirs, kings of Scot-
" land, ſhould do homage for them allenarly,
" and not at all for the kingdom of Scotland itſelf,
" to the king of England and his heirs. *6to. That*
" *in all events, the name, title and dignity of the king-*
" *dom of Scotland ſhould be honourably and inviolably*
" *preſerved*, without union or annexation to that
" of England; and that, for this effect, the ſove-
" reign of both ſhould be ſtiled the *kings*, in the
" plural number, or otherwiſe, *the king of England*
" *and Scotland. 7mo.* That the ſaid ſovereign, after
" being crowned king of England, *ſhould come in*
" *perſon, and be alſo crowned king of Scotland* at
" Scoon, in the marble chair, which ſhould forth-
" with be tranſmitted from London to Scoon. *8vo.*
" *That he ſhould keep his Scots parliament within the*

" *bounds*

" *bounds of Scotland, and no where elſe.* 9*no.* That
" at his coronation he ſhould ſwear to maintain
" the church of Scotland free and independent of
" all archbiſhops and others whoever, the ſee of
" Rome only excepted, as alſo the laws and
" ſtatutes made by the good kings of Scotland,
" and *ſhould not call, nor ſuffer any Scotſman to be*
" *called out of the kingdom of Scotland to any judica-*
" *tory in being.* 10*mo. That he ſhould ſuffer no ec-*
" *cleſiaſtical dignities nor revenues within Scotland to*
" *be conferred on any but Scotſmen.* 11*mo. That all*
" *temporal dignities, and places of profit, ſuch as thoſe*
" *of chancellor, chamberlain, judge, ſheriff, provoſt,*
" *baillie, guardians of towns and caſtles, within Scot-*
" *land, ſhould be intruſted with none but Scotſmen.*
" 12*mo.* That all prelates, earls, barons, freehold-
" ers, ſhould be maintained in the rights and pri-
" vileges they then enjoyed. 13*tio.* That the earl
" of Douglas ſhould be reponed to the lands en-
" joyed by his father and uncle in England.
" 14*to.* That none of the grants made by the late
" king Robert, or the preſent king David, or any
" of their predeceſſors, ſhould ever be recalled.
" 15*to. That the merchants of Scotland ſhould have*
" *full liberty of commerce and trade with the Engliſh,*

" *and*

" *and that they ſhould not be obliged to go any where,*
" *not even to Calais,*" (which ſhould ſeem to have been then the ſtaple port for Engliſh wool, their greateſt commodity in thoſe days) " *but might pur-*
" *chaſe wool in England itſelf, upon paying but half*
" *a mark cuſtom for the ſack of it.* 16*to.* That the
" ſovereign, wherever he ſhould chance to be,
" *ſhould always have by him a council of Scots peers*
" *and lords, for the direction of Scots affairs.* 17*mo.*
" *That he ſhould impoſe no taxes on Scotland, but ſuch*
" *as had been paid to, and exacted by the beſt of*
" *Scots kings.* 18*vo.* That he ſhould not oblige
" the Scots to ſerve in the wars, otherwiſe than
" was uſual before, nor to keep the field at their
" own charges above forty days at a time; and
" that if the exigency of affairs required any of
" them to continue longer in the ſervice, they
" ſhould be paid out of the exchequer, conform
" to their rank and quality. 19*no.* That as often
" as the ſovereign ſhould be crowned at Scoon,
" the articles of this agreement ſhould be read to
" the king and people, and the former ſhould
" take an oath to keep them inviolable. 20*mo.*
" In fine, that the king of England was willing
" to grant, by the advice of his council, what-
" ever

" ever elſe the three communities of the kingdom " of Scotland ſhould aſk for their further ſecurity " and ſatisfaction."

Such were the terms of alliance offered by the powerful, wiſe, and ambitious Edward III. to the Scots nation, when apparently reduced to the loweſt ebb of power. Theſe terms are ſo very diſtinct and explicit, that to conſume either our own time, or that of the reader, in commenting on them, were altogether ſuperfluous. The reader will, at firſt view, perceive how incomparably more honourable and advantageous they were, in every reſpect, than thoſe agreed to by the Scots about four centuries after, when in circumſtances the moſt favourable and proſperous imaginable. But however honourable, and however advantageous theſe terms of alliance propoſed by Edward may appear to us, our forefathers, whoſe notions of things differed extremely from ours, were ſo jealous of the independency of their country, which they ſuſpected, and I believe with reaſon, might be conſequentially affected by ſo intimate a connection with their rich and powerful neighbours, that when their king communicated the projected

projected treaty in parliament, they refuſed to permit it even to be reaſoned on.

We read of no further attempts for bringing about this great object of an union, till the time of James I. of England, unleſs, perhaps, the very politick conduct of of Henry VII. in beſtowing on James IV. king of Scots, Margaret, the eldeſt of his two daughters, in preference to the French king, though the ſuit of the latter was ſupported by moſt of his counſellors, may be accounted ſuch. Henry, on that occaſion, very ſhrewdly obſerved, that in the event of his male deſcendents failing, it were better the crown of England ſhould devolve on a Scottiſh than on a French monarch; becauſe, as the former would naturally fix the ſeat of his government in the greater kingdom, his hereditary dominions would, by that means, become an acceſſory to thoſe of England; whereas, by devolving on a French monarch, the very reverſe would happen. Experience accordingly juſtified this ſenſible opinion of Henry; for it was as heir of this very marriage that James I. ſucceeded to the Engliſh throne, an

an event that was attended with the conſequences ſo ſagaciouſly predicted by king Henry.

James, very ſoon after his acceſſion to the crown of England, formed a plan for effecting a more intimate union between his two kingdoms: but his endeavours, as well as thoſe of his grandſon, Charles II. for the ſame purpoſe, proved abortive: it were unneceſſary therefore to make particular mention of them.

At laſt the project of an union was reſumed more ſeriouſly than ever by queen Anne, and appears very clearly to have been a capital object in the politicks of that princeſs's miniſtry, which was compoſed of the ableſt ſtateſman, without exception, that ever managed the affairs of England. Accordingly the ſucceſs of the negociation was anſwerable to the abilities of thoſe by whom it was conducted; and a treaty of union, which had been ſo often attempted in vain, was, under their auſpices, brought to a final concluſion between the two kingdoms, and that on terms ſo ſingularly advantageous and honourable for England, and ſo extremely diſgraceful and ruinous for

for Scotland, that were they to be announced to Edward III. in the ſhades, the authority of an angel would be hardly ſufficient to make him believe the intelligence.

As the introductory ſtep to this important work, an act of the Scots parliament was very artfully obtained by the miniſtry, authoriſing the Queen to name the commiſſioners for Scotland, who were to ſetttle the terms of Union with thoſe for England, whom the Queen likewiſe named. This great point gained, the commiſſioners on both ſides met for the firſt time on the 16th of April, 1706; and meaſures had been ſo prudently concerted, that, in ſpite of the numberleſs obſtacles which muſt unavoidably have occurred, the articles of Union were finally agreed on before the 16th of July following.

Still, however, the moſt difficult part of the buſineſs remained, namely, to obtain a ratification of thoſe articles by the parliament of Scotland. That they might have the fewer obſtacles to encounter in this branch of the negotiation, the promoters of the Union had concealed, with the greateſt

greateſt care, the terms agreed on by the commiſſioners; becauſe, being thoroughly ſenſible how extremely diſagreeable they muſt prove to the people of Scotland, they were very deſirous to avoid the conſequences of the univerſal ferment which the firſt mention of them would create in that country.

Nothing therefore was certainly known in Scotland, with reſpect to the articles of the union, till the whole treaty was at once laid before the Scots Parliament. But notwithſtanding theſe precautions, no ſooner were they generally known over the country, than all ranks teſtified ſuch a degree of reſentment and indignation as cannot be expreſt. Nothing prevailed but an univerſal uproar; nothing was heard but vows of revenge, and the bittereſt imprecations againſt thoſe who had ſo baſely betrayed the honour and intereſt of their country: addreſſes without number were preſented to the parliament, remonſtrating in the ſtrongeſt terms againſt an union on the conditions propoſed. In many places the people flew to arms, reſolved, if all other means failed, to prevent by force the accompliſhment of a meaſure in

every view ſo infamous and detrimental. But ſuch artful means had been uſed by the miniſtry, either to corrupt or overawe all the men of any influence, that no proper perſon appeared to head the general commotion.

The court party were however greatly alarmed, and thought it neceſſary, in order to provide for their perſonal ſecurity, as well as to facilitate the ſucceſs of their operations, to practiſe the moſt tyrannical expedients. All the ſtanding forces of the kingdom were aſſembled in the neighbourhood of Edinburgh; ſtrong detachments were poſted in the different quarters of that city; and the Parliament-houſe in particular was ſurrounded by a formidable body of guards: nay, the privy council ventured to iſſue a proclamation, commanding all perſons to retire from the ſtreets at a minute's warning, under the pain of being fired at by the guards, to whom a general indemnity was previouſly granted for all the fatal conſequences of ſuch firing.

In the mean time, meaſures of a very different nature, but more effectual than even the former, were

were ſucceſsfully practiſed by the court party. As it had been foreſeen from the beginning, that an Union, on the terms intended, would bein the laſt degree diſguſtful to the people of Scotland, and by conſequence, would meet with a powerful oppoſition in their parliament, proper precautions for defeating ſuch oppoſition had been very ſkilfully provided, namely, *a large ſum of money to be tranſmitted into Scotland.* As the ſum judged neceſſary for this purpoſe, was too great either to be clandeſtinely abſtracted from the Engliſh treaſury, or conveyed without detection into Scotland, a method for obviating both theſe inconveniences was deviſed, on grounds truly juſt and reaſonable: the ſum of three hundred ninety eight thouſand, eighty five pounds was, by the articles of Union, provided to the Scots, as an equivalent for ſuch part of the Engliſh national debt, as they ſhould be burdened with in conſequence of the Union. But tho' the pretence for allowing the Scots this money was highly equitable, yet the ſubſequent diſpoſal of it plainly evinced that it was really intended to procure a majority in the Scots parliament. Still, however, this ſum, large as it was, proved inſufficient to obtain the wiſhed for ratifi-

cation. Further ſums therefore became neceſſary to inſure the ſucceſs of this deciſive meaſure: and ſuch ſums were accordingly furniſhed by the Engliſh miniſtry; but in ſo ſecret a manner, that I have been able hitherto to diſcover with certainty only one remittance, tho' a pretty conſiderable one indeed, amounting to twenty thouſand pounds, which was chiefly diſtributed among the leaders of a party in the Scots parliament, ſtiled at the time, with great propriety, the *Squadrone Volante*; who, after fluctuating long, from ſide to ſide, both to acquire the reputation of integrity, and likeways to render themſelves the more precious in the eyes of the miniſtry, in conſequence of this money, ranged themſelves immoveably with the court party, and thereby gave them the ſo much deſired ſuperiority of numbers.

But ſtill, notwithſtanding all the miniſterial arts of promiſes, threats, and actual corruption, the treaty met with a moſt vigorous oppoſition within doors; where, without attempting to refute by argument the many unanſwerable objections ſtarted againſt it, its promoters very wiſely referred every point to a vote, by which means the

treaty

treaty was at laſt ratified by a ſmall majority in the parliament of Scotland.

As this treaty is in the hands of every body, and is perfectly well underſtood, a particular enumeration of its various articles were altogether ſuperfluous. Suffice it therefore to mention the ſubſtance of it in a few words. By the Union, the two kingdoms of England and Scotland are inſeparably united into one, to be in all time coming denominated the kingdom of Great Britain. The ſupreme legiſlative authority of the whole kingdom is lodged in one and the ſame parliament, comprehending 772 members, of whom the repreſentatives of Scotland are in number 61. Every native of the united kingdom is indiſcriminately intitled to the ſame privileges, and ſubjected to the ſame reſtrictions, with the exceptions to be afterwards taken notice of. The laws reſpecting government and public policy are to be the ſame throughout the whole united kingdom; but the municipal law of Scotland is declared unalterable, unleſs for the evident utility of the country.

From what has been ſaid, it is clear, that this treaty of union was brought about in Scotland, as Sir John Packington very roundly aſſerted at the time in the Engliſh Houſe of Commons, "*by bri-* "*bery and corruption within doors, and by force and* "*violence without.*" But you, our brethren of England, muſt not conceive the worſe opinion of the patriotiſm and integrity of the Scots in general, becauſe you ſee on this occaſion a ſmall majority (it is truly amazing that it was not vaſtly greater) in their parliament bought for the ſum of four hundred eighteen thouſand pounds. The temptation was ſo prodigious, that I queſtion not but, notwithſtanding the incorruptible patriotiſm of the Engliſhmen of the preſent times, the Scots, by a ſkilful diſtribution of an equal ſum in South Britain, might in the 1706 have obtained terms of union totally the reverſe of thoſe then impoſed on them ſo much againſt their inclination. For an attentive review of the tranſactions in Europe, for the laſt fifty years, will ſhew us, that a much ſmaller ſum has often produced a ſimiler effect in aſſemblies far more reſpectable in every view than the ancient parliament of the poor country of Scotland.

Such

Such is the hiſtory and general import of this famous treaty, which, with all due deference to the opinion of our late party writers, I will venture to pronounce *the moſt honourable and advantageous to England, and the moſt diſgraceful and ruinous to Scotland* that can be pointed out in the whole annals of mankind, as having ever been entered into by two independent ſtates. This will no doubt appear ſtrange and improbable to you, our counmen of England, accuſtomed as you are to give implicit faith to all the impudent aſſertions of your preſent political oracles; who, not ſatisfied with repreſenting the Scots as a generation of ſlaves, devoid of every generous ſentiment, have, moreover, deſcribed us as a race of ſtarving vultures, perpetually preying on the vitals of Old England. This being the inſinuation thoſe worthy gentlemen found the moſt effectual for alarming your jealouſy againſt your unfortunate fellow ſubjects of the North, has been principally inſiſted on by them, and improved and heightened with the moſt malevolent ingenuity. As it is therefore highly proper you ſhould be undeceived in this reſpect, I will proceed fairly to examine on which

ſide

ſide the diſhonour and diſadvantage reſulting from this famous treaty really lies.

If to forfeit, without any crime by them committed, nearly four fifths of the conſtituent members of its parliament of their moſt valuable privilege, that of governing themſelves and their countrymen——If to transfer from its own hands all power over the lives and properties of its ſubjects——If to make a voluntary ſurrender of every mark of ſovereignty and independency——In one word, if to conſtitute itſelf, by its own act and deed, a ſervile province of a rival kingdom, be accounted diſhonourable in any ſtate, all this was done by Scotland by its conſenting to the treaty of Union.

By annihilating their own parliament, and accepting in its place about a thirteenth part repreſentation in that of England, without even inſiſting on the obvious and equitable condition of having all queſtions regarding Scotland, whoſe conſtitution and circumſtances differed extremely from thoſe of England, determined by a majority of the repreſentatives of Scotland, the Scots acted like a man,

a man, who, after binding his hands and feet, ſhould preſent his throat to the knife of his mortal enemy: nay, what was, if poſſible, more unaccountable ſtill, they conferred on an Engliſh Houſe of Peers, who, whatever knowledge the experience of ſixty years has happily procured them in the laws and uſages peculiar to Scotland, at the time of the Union made no pretentions to any, an uncontroulable power of deciding, in the laſt reſort, all queſtions of private right that might ariſe among the inhabitants of Scotland; and thereby laid themſelves under the neceſſity of travelling four or five hundred miles, at a monſtrous expence too, before they can obtain an ultimate determination in the moſt trifling law ſuit.——In ſhort, the Scottiſh Union-makers behaved exactly in the ſame manner as if the people of England ſhould at this moment incorporate themſelves with their neighbours of France, without demanding any other ſecurity for their ſo much extolled liberty than a twentieth part repreſentation in the ſovereign legiſlative court of that kingdom, ſuppoſing the form of government in both countries to be the ſame. How would an Engliſhman reliſh ſuch a propoſal? Let any perſon of common ſenſe conſider

ſider all theſe circumſtances, and then candidly declare, whether a more diſgraceful tranſaction could poſſibly be agreed to by a ſovereign independent ſtate: and whether any conceſſions or privileges, in the power of our neighbours to conferr on us, could in any degree counterballance the diſhonour thence ariſing.

Nor was the Union leſs *ruinous* to Scotland than it was diſhonourable. This to be ſure will appear to you, our countrymen of England, a very ridiculous paradox; but the fact is not for that the leſs true. Tho' before the Union we were, indeed, what, in ſpite of all the golden pre-predictions with which our worthy Union-makers amuſed us, we ſtill continue to be, a very poor nation, nevertheleſs we poſſeſt reſources ſufficient for all the exigences of government, and that too without being oppreſt by any taxes on the neceſſaries of life, or having our commerce cramped by any heavy duties. But no ſooner did the Union take place, than our wealthy friends of England were not aſhamed, moſt unmercifully, to overwhelm us, poor as we were, with a grievous load of taxes, and almoſt to ſtifle our trade, inconſiderable

able as it was, with an infinity of cuſtoms and reſtrictions, to which we were before utter ſtrangers: we were beſides ſubjected proportionally with them, to the vaſt ſum of ſeventeen millions of Engliſh national debt: a board of cuſtoms, and another of Exciſe, two fruitful ſeminaries of a race of vermin, who live in idleneſs and luxury on the labours of their fellow citizens, were eſtabliſhed amongſt us: and our country was depopulated to furniſh levies for ſupplying the ravages of a moſt bloody and ruinous continental war, with which we had before no manner of concern.

Nor is even this the full meaſure of our ſufferings: two thirds of our countryare diſarmed, like an hoſtile province. Many of the moſt profitable offices of our cuſtoms and exciſe are beſtowed on Engliſhmen, and theſe, for the moſt part, neither gentlemen nor men of merit, but the baſeſt tools, and often the menial ſervants of Engliſh courtiers: Nay, of the five judges who compoſe one of our ſupreme courts, namely the exchequer, the lord chief baron, and one of the ordinary barons, are always Engliſhmen. Beſides all this, many material alterations have been made in our municipal law;

law; among which, that in particular, ſubjecting us to the Engliſh law of treaſon, is by the people of Scotland unreaſonably, perhaps, deemed detrimental rather than uſeful to their country: our peerage are diſgraced by a diſtincton, which their more numerous brethren of England have thought proper to deduce, not directly, but by implication, from the articles of union, namely, *That no peer of Scotland can be created a peer of Great Britain*, while, at the ſame time, the proportion of *Engliſh* peers is daily encreaſing by a great number of new creations; a circumſtance that to many ſenſibly people appears extremely ſtrange: and at laſt we have, as already obſerved, ſeen ſome Engliſh politicians arraign the appointment of a Scotſman to any of the great offices of ſtate, as an attack on the Engliſh conſtitution. In fine, the numberleſs diſadvantages reſulting to Scotland from the Union, were ſo quickly and ſo ſeverely felt, that about five years after its commencement, the ſixteen peers, repreſenting Scotland in the upper houſe, though moſt of them had been very active in promoting that meaſure, were not aſhamed openly to acknowledge the folly of their former conduct, and unanimouſly

unanimouſly to move in the houſe of peers for a diſſolution of the Union. But our Engliſh friends were too wiſe to gratify them in that particular. Could there poſſibly be a more convincing proof of the ruinous conſequences entailed on the Scots by the treaty of Union?

Let us now inquire what mighty advantages Scotland was to reap in return for all her invaluable conceſſions above enumerated. Firſt then, the ſum of 398,000 *l.* was, as already noticed, allowed us as an equivalent for the proportion of the great debt due by England, to which we were ſubjected. This ſurely never can be accounted a favour to the Scots, ſince in the faireſt light it was no more than the moſt rigorous juſtice. But it is a certain truth, that this great ſum provided to the Scots, under ſo equitable a pretence, was, as already obſerved, really intended by the Engliſh miniſtry as a bribe to gain a majority in the Scots parliament, and at the ſame time to accompliſh a very important private project of their own, namely, the diſſolution of the Scots African company. It is very extraordinary, that a great part of this money, was, by an article of the Union,

Union, ſpecifically deſtined to pay off the ſtock of that company; a meaſure ſo far from being advantageous to the people of Scotland, that it was in the laſt degree prejudicial to them, being a ſacrifice, in favour of their Engliſh friends, of the only valuable privilege then left them. But not content with this ſacrifice alone, the Engliſh obliged them to purchaſe it with the very money which was ſo equitably provided to the Scots nation in general.

This great commercial company had been long beheld with a jealous eye by our Southern neighbours, who were juſtly apprehenſive of its becoming in a little time a dangerous rival to their Eaſt India company, than a great favourite of their government. Its diſſolution, therefore, had been ſtrenuouſly inſiſted on by the Engliſh commiſſioners at the conferences for an Union in the time of Charles II. and the firmneſs of the Scots, in maintaining its intereſts, was the principal cauſe of the failure of that attempt. Between that period, however, and the year 1706, the African company had ſuſtained conſiderable loſſes, chiefly through the jealouſy between the Engliſh and Scots,

Scots, ſo that the commiſſioners for England had then no great difficulty in perſuading thoſe for Scotland to give it up; and indeed the latter were ſo complaiſantly diſpoſed, that in all probability they would have complied as readily with the demands of their Engliſh friends in this reſpect, although the company had been in the moſt flouriſhing ſituation. The Engliſh, however, to ſhew their ſingular care for the intereſts of the company, obliged the Scots to pay up the whole capital ſtock, without deduction of any loſſes, together with intereſt at the rate of five per cent. This ſkilful management, as hinted above, anſwered a double purpoſe; it removed out of the way a formidable rival in the Eaſt India trade, and at the ſame time induced ſuch of the proprietors as were members of parliament, to promote the Union, in the hopes of receiving at once ſo conſiderable a ſum of money, which they had then no immediate proſpect of ever recovering in any other manner.

But was it fair in the Engliſh, thus to oblige the Scots to make this private purchaſe for their behoof with the greateſt part of the Equivalent,

ſo

ſo juſtly provided to the people of Scotland in general, for the heavy burden of Engliſh debt, that was, by the Union, impoſed on them?— And was not the diſſolution of this company, inſtead of an advantage to the Scots, the moſt valuable conceſſion they could now make in favour of their Southern neighbours, after having already reſigned every mark of freedom and independency? I will take upon me to affirm, that this reſignation of their liberty of trading to India, was more than an equal compenſation for the privilege conferred on the Scots, by the Union, of trading to the Engliſh ſettlements in North America, and the Weſt Indies. As for the remainder of this money, ſo improperly called *an Equivalent*, it is notorious that it was moſt ſcandalouſly miſapplied and embezzled. And it has been repeatedly aſſerted, without contradiction, that it was employed to fullfil the private engagements previouſly entered into between our miniſtry and particular members of the Scots parliament, for obtaining their influence in ſupport of the Union.

In the next place, an eaſe of about 50,000*l.* a year, in the article of land tax, was granted to the Scots by the Union. This, no doubt, is a real and unambiguous conceſſion on the part of our Engliſh friends. But when it is conſidered, that notwithſtanding the poverty of our country, with which you are continually upbraiding us, we pay at this moment the full proportion of every tax leviable in England, certainly this trifling eaſe cannot be accounted ſo great a favour; nay, by your own confeſſion, it is highly reaſonable: even rating it at its higheſt value, it would ſeem to be hardly an equal conſideration for that extraordinary proportion, without taking into the account any other of the grievances, under which the people of Scotland are known to labour. We hold this eaſe however, trifling as it is, at the mercy of the Britiſh parliament, in which you, our countrymen of England, poſſeſs a majority of ſeven hundred and eleven voices.

I come now to conſider what is generally accounted, both by Engliſh and Scots, the moſt valuable privilege of all conferred by the Union on the latter; namely, *Liberty of Commerce*. This

was the grand argument with which the promoters of the Union anſwered all the objections moved againſt the treaty at that time. Thoſe worthy patriots endeavoured to perſuade the Scots, that the notions of independency and national honour, for the maintainance of which their forefathers had been ſo prodigal of their blood, were merely chimerical; that by reſigning them, they tranſferred, from their own to their neighbours ſhoulders, an unneceſſary and troubleſome load; and, that inſtead of thoſe ideal ſubſtances, they ſhould, in conſequence of the Liberty of Commerce, with which they were to be indulged, ſhortly poſſeſs ſolid treaſures of gold and ſilver.

Here it is proper once more to recall the reader's attention to the terms of alliance propoſed by Edward III. as already mentioned, where he will find this ſo much boaſted Liberty of Commerce offered the Scots by that wiſe and powerful prince, after he had, to all appearance, reduced them to the laſt extremity, in as ample a manner as it is granted by the treaty of Union; and that without requiring any other ſacrifice from the Scots in return, than their conſent to

a *federal*

a *federal* Union, by which " the name, title and " dignity of the kingdom of Scotland, were to be " honourably and inviolably preſerved—The " parliament of Scotland was to be holden within " the bounds of Scotland—No Scotſman was to " be called out of Scotland to be tried by any " judicatory whatever—No taxes were to be im- " poſed upon the Scots but ſuch as had been " exacted by the beſt of the Scots Kings—And " all dignities and places of profit were to be con- " ferred on none but Scotſmen :" yet, at a time when Scotland was in circumſtances every way the reverſe of thoſe under which it laboured in the time of Edward III. even in its moſt proſperous days, every diſadvantage, from which Edward offered to relieve us, was readily ſubmitted to, and the honour and independency of our kingdom, which even the ambitious Edward reſpected, and expreſſed his willingneſs to ſecure, were ſhamefully ſurrendered.—What a humiliating contraſt between the conduct of the ſervile Unioners, and their magnanimous forefathers !—But the cauſe of this difference is ſufficiently apparent : the leading men among the Scots, in the days of Edward III. were uniformly actuated by ſuch

patriotick ſentiments, as in all ages and nations have produced the moſt glorious and heroick actions; they preferred, therefore, the honour and independency of their country to all the allurements of luxury and wealth. Unhappily for this country, many of their offspring were ſo degenerated, as to be no longer proof againſt theſe temptations. Hence they baſely preferred their own private intereſt to the glory and welfare of their country.

But let us proceed to inquire, whether this *Liberty of Commerce* be of ſo great conſequence as it has been repreſented, and whether our riches have really increaſed in proportion to the mighty profeſſions of the Union-makers. The firſt ſtep taken, reſpecting our commerce, was, as already noticed, the total ſuppreſſion of our greateſt commercial company, that which traded to Africa and the Eaſt Indies, that it might not interfere with the Engliſh Eaſt India company; which, in conſequence of great government encouragement, was then in a very flouriſhing ſituation. To accompliſh this *national* purpoſe, a great part of the Equivalent was moſt unjuſtly applied; ſo that the

the Scots were not only obliged, as already noticed, to ſurrender a privilege fully equal, in my opinion, to every commercial advantage conferred on them by the Union, but even to purchaſe this privilege from the private parties, in whom it was then veſted, with their own money, although the benefit of it was wholly to redound to their neighbours of England. In the next place, the price of labour was conſiderably advanced, in conſequence of the many taxes impoſed on the moſt common neceſſaries of life, and our trade was burdened with various cuſtoms and reſtrictions. Theſe taxes and cuſtoms had been rendered neceſſary in England by the expence of government, but had never been before heard of in Scotland. Now, for my part, I cannot conceive how the commerce of Scotland could poſſibly be advanced by theſe two meaſures, unleſs it can be ſhewn that commerce, like the camomile, the more it is oppreſſed, the more luxuriant it grows. But to come more directly to the point:

By the *Liberty of Commerce* granted to the Scots by the Union, no more could be meant than liberty

liberty to trade, under the reſtrictions already mentioned, to the Engliſh colonies, and to England itſelf; for our commerce with the other European ſtates, with the Levant, and with the Spaniſh, French, and Dutch plantations, could not be by the treaty of Union enlarged, but indeed might be, and I believe was reſtrained. Now, it is well known, that at the time of the Union, the Engliſh ſettlements were, upon the whole, rather burdenſome than beneficial to the mother country; and it is equally well known, that the ſtate of proſperity at which they are now arrived, is almoſt entirely owing to the treaty of Union; ſince in all probability, without the aſſiſtance of Scotland, they neither could have been ſo quickly conquered and peopled, nor ſo effectually defended during the courſe of the two laſt wars expecially, but more particularly the laſt, when the preſervation of North America, and the conqueſts made both there and in the Eaſt and Weſt Indies likewiſe, were almoſt wholly effected by Scottiſh troops.

The commercial advantages, therefore, derived to the Scots from the plantations, are, properly ſpeaking,

ſpeaking, the fruits of their own labours, and extremely dear bought too, conſidering the multitude of lives they have coſt us. Theſe advantages however are far from being ſo conſiderable as they are commonly imagined. I will not pretend to determine what the annual amount of them may exactly be, but it is certain that the American trade is almoſt excluſively confined to the corner about Glaſgow: and we may judge pretty certainly of the wealth thence diffuſed into the reſt of Scotland from this circumſtance, that two private Banks, eſtabliſhed in Glaſgow, not only employ all the caſh to be found in that country, but are continually draining, with the utmoſt induſtry, from every other quarter of Scotland, the ſmall quantity of ſpecie ſtill left amongſt us, and yet, after all, find it difficult to anſwer the daily demands of their trifling circulation.

But it is likely, that in caſe the Union had never taken place, and our neighbours of England had never found it neceſſary to conferr the privilege of a free trade upon us, in conſideration of the efficacious aſſiſtance we could have afforded them in planting and defending their colonies, as well

as

as protecting their country at home; it is likely, I ſay, that they muſt have taken from us every commodity we at this moment furniſh to the colonies: or if they had not taken theſe commodities off our hands, it is next to certain, the French and Spaniards would, and that even at a higher rate than we preſently ſell them for in America. In every view therefore, the profit derived to us from our commerce with the colonies, inconſiderable as this profit is, can with no propriety be placed to the account of the Union.

But I will go a ſtep further, and venture to aſſert, that the intercourſe with the Engliſh ſettlements, opened to us by the Union, ſo far from being an advantage, has proved the greateſt misfortune that could have befallen us; for it has not only diverted our attention from a more certain and profitable trade, which it was in our power to have carried on with the other European ſtates, and with the Levant, but it has, for the threefold purpoſe of conquering, peopling, and defending them, drained our country of ſo many of its moſt uſeful inhabitants, as an excluſive privilege of their commerce for a thouſand years could

could in no degree compenſate. And what valuable commodities have theſe plantations yielded us in return?—Inſtead of filling our country with the vaſt riches we were made to expect, they have brought us nothing but a few baneful articles of luxury.

But perhaps you may imagine, my countrymen, that the profit of our trade with England is more than ſufficient ſingly to counter-ballance all the diſadvantages brought upon us by the treaty of Union. But ſo far is this from being the caſe, that I will undertake to demonſtrate, that our trade with England is itſelf the greateſt of all theſe diſadvantages. A direct and irrefragable proof of this, is the courſe of exchange between South and North Britain; which, notwithſtanding the contiguity of the two countries, runs ſo much againſt the Scots, that, for theſe laſt ſix years, London bills have, at a medium, ſold in Edinburgh for the extravagant premium of two per cent.

Again—Thoſe who are the beſt acquainted with the commercial affairs of Scotland, aſſure us, that

that the annual ballance ariſing in our favour from our foreign trade, amounts at leaſt to three hundred thouſand pounds. So great a ſum as this, annually flowing into our country, muſt, one would naturally imagine, literally fulfil the predictions of our Union-makers, and ſoon make Scotland a land of Ophir indeed. But alas! ſo far is this from being the caſe, that we can by no means procure the ſmall quantity of ſpecie requiſite for carrying on our manufactures, being obliged to employ, for this moſt neceſſary purpoſe, a paper currency to an alarming extent. Nay, the little ſpecie we actually poſſeſs is brought us from England, at ſo great an expence, that the ſum required for ſupporting the circulation of the two national banks, coſts them about four thouſand pounds a year. But it will no doubt be here asked, what then becomes of this ſum of three hundred thouſand pounds annually gained to your country by its foreign trade? I will anſwer the queſtion in very few words. The four articles of broad cloth, hardware, millinery goods, and porter, furniſhed us by you, our friends of England, are well known to draw from Scotland thrice the amount of all the commodities you receive

receive from us. Now, when we likewiſe bring into the account the infinite number of other articles imported into Scotland from South Britain, ſuch as leather, wool, hats, together with Eaſt India and grocery goods of every denomination, we ſhall have little difficuly to diſcover what becomes of the large ballance above-mentioned, annually brought into Scotland by its foreign trade.

But ſtill this is far from being the whole of the loſs, in point of pecuniary intereſt, reſulting to North Britian from its preſent connexion with England. In conſequence of the ſeat of government being confined to England, ſeveral of our richeſt noblemen* are induced to recide *conſtantly* in that country: of the reſt of that wealthy body, four fifths, reckoning by the extent of their fortunes, live there nine months of the year at leaſt,

* Notwithſtanding all the fooliſh ſneering of the author of the North Briton, the nobility of Scotland are, in general, as *independent* in their fortunes, and perhaps more ſo than thoſe of England. Of this I might quote many particular inſtances, but the taſk would be equally impertinent and unneceſſary. Let this *begging Patriot*, therefore, amuſe himſelf at pleaſure with the poverty of Scottiſh nobility.

partly

partly out of choice, partly to attend their duty in parliament: our repreſentatives in the Houſe of Commons, together with many other gentlemen of the greateſt eſtates in Scotland, follow the example of the nobility: nay, almoſt every perſon poſſeſt of five hundred a year, and many whoſe income is much leſs, generally viſit London once in three or four years; where, in the ſpace of a month or two, they ſpend, with ridiculous profuſion, the full amount perhaps of their annual revenue. When we reflect on all this, and likewiſe on the extravagant expence of proſecuting Scots appeals before the Houſe of Peers, we may form ſome idea of the vaſt ſums conſtantly paſſing into England from this *poor deſpiſed* Northern corner, which is really poor and contemptible ſolely in conſequence of its connection with England.

It was ſtrongly urged by the promoters of the Union, and will no doubt be here objected to me, "that in conſequence of the Union we live "in a ſtate of eaſe and ſecurity, and thence have "leiſure to improve our country, to encreaſe our "manufactures, and to extend our commerce."

This

This argument, allowing it all the force its ſupporters can deſire, is ſo preciſely that of a mean ſpirited coward, and might be urged, with equal propriety, to perſuade every free and independent people to reſign their freedom to the firſt powerful enemy who ſhould attempt to ſubdue them.—"Why, my countrymen," might ſome corrupted declaimer in ſuch a caſe ſay, "Why "expoſe ourſelves to certain death and deſtruc- "tion, when, by ſubmitting to this formidable "enemy, we may readily purchaſe peace, and, "by becoming a ſubmiſſive ally, not only live "free of all apprehenſion from that quarter for "the future, but, under the protection of their "arms, employ ourſelves in improving our coun- "try, advancing our manufactures, and extend- "ing our commerce." Every ſoul, animated by the ſmalleſt ſpark of liberty, muſt undoubtedly hold in abhorrence ſo daſtardly a counſel. Whoever had dared barely to inſinuate ſuch a propoſal to the barons of Scotland in the days of Edward III. had aſſuredly experienced the treatment his baſeneſs deſerved, and been branded with everlaſting infamy.

But

But I do maintain, that theſe benefits might have been much more effectually attained, had we continued to live with you, our Engliſh friends, on the ſame footing on which we were living with you at the time of the Union, and had lived with you for more than a cenury before, profeſſing allegiance to the ſame Sovereign—ever ready, when applied to in a proper manner, to co-operate with you on an equal footing in all meaſures that regarded either the honour of that ſovereign, or the general intereſts of the iſland—but continuing ſtill to act as an independent ſtate, ſubject to no laws but thoſe enacted by its own Parliament, enforced and explained by its own ſupreme courts of juſtice.

Then we ſhould have run no danger of having any laws impoſed on us that were repugnant to the nature of our conſtitution, or incompatible with the circumſtances of our country; nor of having, at any time, (for at preſent there is certainly not the leaſt ground for ſuch a ſuppoſition) either our excellent municipal law miſinterpreted, or our private properties diſpoſed of, in the laſt reſort, by judges not ſufficiently converſant in the laws and uſages peculiar to Scotland: for altho' the preſent Parliament of

Great

Great Britain teſtifies the utmoſt abhorrence of thoſe pernicious doctrines advanced by the author of the North Britain and his imitators, and in its conduct, towards every part of the united Kingdom, invariably purſues the ſame rules of the moſt impartial juſtice; and altho' the Houſe of Peers, in particular, diſplays, on every occaſion, a perfect knowledge in the law of Scotland, and a ſingular regard for that law; yet who can tell how far ſuch doctrines may be hearkened to in ſome remote period; and whether the moſt honourable Houſe of Peers ſhall *always* continue as ſupremely juſt and learned as it is at preſent? Gentlemen of greateſt abilities and fortune, being then neceſſarily confined within the limits of their own country, muſt have conſidered themſelves as more intimately concerned in the welfare of that country, and thence would have had it more in their power, as well as inclination, to have promoted its agriculture, manufactures, and commerce; and at the ſame time to have beſtowed more particular attention on the other minute particulars or internal police—Then alſo, in all probability, we ſhould have been in a great meaſure free of the immenſe load of taxes with which we are now oppreſſed, to the extent of near twelve

ſhillings

ſhillings in the pound, and by that means ſhould have been enabled to underſell every rival in manufactures, as the price of labour muſt then have been ſo much cheaper——Nor would our commerce have been burdened and confined by ſuch numberleſs impoſts and reſtrictions—We ſhould likeways have been at liberty, either totally to reſtrain our loſing trade with England, which at preſent drains us of all the money that our commerce with the other ſtates of Europe procures us, or at leaſt to have put it under ſuch regulations as might have rendered it leſs pernicious to the community, and at the ſame time a very conſiderable branch of publick revenue.

But what is of more importance ſtill, our country would not then have been ſo miſerably drained of her braveſt ſons, to fight the battles of our wealthy neighbours, and in their quarrel to periſh in the unhoſpitable climes of America, or enrich, with their blood, the fatal plains of Hanover: nor would the diſfigured remains of them that had eſcaped the dangers and fatigues of war, have experienced the bittereſt of all mortifications, that of being ungratefully inſulted by the

the very people, in whoſe cauſe they had ſuffered ſo many hardſhips—Then, inſtead of having two thirds of our country ſhamefully diſarmed as an hoſtile province, and being on all occaſions treated with the moſt provoking contumely, our friendſhip had been courted by our Engliſh neighbonrs, who muſt ſoon have learned to regard us as their moſt natural and uſeful allies—And, finally, inſtead of being ſo grievouſly taxed to ſupport the expences of their government, we had been enriched with ſubſidies, and indulged with every encouragement of commerce we might have thought proper to deſire; for if *the Landgrave of Heſſe* alone received, annually, from this kingdom above four hundred thouſand pounds for furniſhing only about twenty thouſand men, (of whom no doubt a ſufficient number were *buckram men)* to defend a country in which he was infinitely more concerned than we were, what might not the Scots have expected for furniſhing, during the courſe of laſt war, upwards of ſeventy thouſand men, and thoſe the braveſt in the whole Britiſh army?

After what has been already ſaid, it is ſurely unneceſſary to be particular in pointing out the many advantages derived from this treaty of Union to you, our fellow ſubjects of England, ſince every article of loſs and diſhonour on our part, is evidently an article of gain and honour on yours. Your commercial advantages alone amount, as already obſerved, to three hundred thouſand pounds a year at leaſt——By acquiring the abſolute ſovereignty of the extenſive territory of Scotland, inhabited by as hardy and brave a race of men as any in the world, you have entirely ſecured yourſelves from all further diſturbance from a People who, in former times, had proved the moſt dangerous of your enemies; and with their aſſiſtance you have been enabled not only to plant, protect, and extend your colonies, but likeways to vanquiſh the combined ſtrength of the two powerful houſes of Auſtria and Bourbon, who, but a little while ago, ſingly aſpired to the ſovereignty of all the reſt of Europe.

In this manner have I endeavoured to prove, even to the conviction of every *Engliſhman* of ſenſe and candour, that the treaty of Union, by which South

South and North Britain are at preſent ſo intimately connected, was brought about by the groſſeſt corruption, contrary to the univerſal inclination of the people of Scotland, to whom, it is hard to ſay, whether it be more diſhonourable or ruinous; and that, on the other hand, inſtead of being diſgraceful or prejudicial to England, as your late political writers have malevolently inſinuated, it is its greateſt advantage, and its higheſt honour.

In the courſe of this enquiry, I have been unwillingly obliged to mention many melancholy circumſtances on the part of my countrymen of the North—Circumſtances which, however painful and galling, were by time almoſt worn from our remembrance, when they were ſo wickedly and unwiſely revived by the ignominious treatment we have of late received at the hands of you our neighbours of the South. We hope, however, the knowledge of theſe circumſtances ſhall incline you to regard, for the future, your brethren of North Britain in a more favourable light; as you will thence perceive what ineſtimable conceſſions we have made, and to what numberleſs diſadvantages we at preſent ſubmit to obtain the ſole privilege

vilege of being received on an equal footing with you, as ſubjects of the ſame ſovereign, and of the ſame government; a privilege to which, even without ſuch conceſſions, we were in every reſpect well intitled.

Upon the whole, we doubt not that our fellow ſubjects of England, ſhall, on cool deliberation, reflect with indignation on the flagitious attempts of thoſe factious great men, and their infamous tools; who, on the one hand, by artfully inſtilling into *your* minds groundleſs and injurious ſuſpicions of the Scots, and on the other, by loading the Scots with the moſt provoking terms of abuſe, have endeavoured to kindle up the flame of diſcord in this otherwiſe happy iſland, to deſtroy that harmony which conſtitutes our only ſtrength and ſecurity, and to provoke us to imbrue our hands in the blood of one another.—How ungenerous! how inhumane! nay, how ungrateful! muſt the conduct of you, our brethren of England, appear to yourſelves, as well as to the reſt of the world, when you ſhall reflect on your having inſulted and maltreated, in the very ſtreets of your metropolis, your moſt affectionate and uſeful

fellow

fellow ſubjects, who have been ſo prodigally laviſh of their blood to render you victorious and great, and who are ſtill ready, provided they be treated but with common indulgence, to confront, in your defence, death and danger under every ſhape?

If, however, after all, you ſhall continue to look upon us in the ſame unfavourable light in which we have of late been repreſented to you, *Diſſolve*, we entreat you, the bond that unites us, and generouſly reſtore us to our original independency; for remember this is in *your* power, not in *ours*. But, at any rate, forbear to inſult us any longer, leſt you may find more reaſon than you expect to repent of your imprudence in driving us to extremity; for, poor and contemptible as you ſeem to ſuppoſe us, we can ſtill bring to the field, without much difficulty, ſixty thouſand of the braveſt men in Europe.

FINIS.

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA